Atty. Dkt. No. MAEE 20065 Application Serial No. 10/810,357 Response to Office Action mailed January 10, 2005

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of January 10, 2005.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-17 remain in this application.

Claims 1 and 11-13 have been amended.

New claim 17 is added.

The Office Action

In the Office Action, claims 10, 15, and 16 were allowed.

Claims 2-4 were objected to, but considered to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have amended claims 11-13 to depend from claim 10 and respectfully submit that claims 11-14 are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Casaldi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,779,578).

Claims 6-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Casaldi, et al. in view of Kerr, et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,640,866).

For the reasons outlined below, it is submitted that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a laminator which includes a housing having an inlet slot and an outlet slot. The laminator includes inlet and outlet trays pivotally connected to the housing which are movable between an operative position and a raised position. In the operative position, the outlet tray is positioned to receive the laminated item from the outlet slot.

Amendments to claim 1 are supported by the specification at paragraph 21.

Atty. Dkt. No. MAEE 20065 Application Serial No. 10/810,357 Response to Office Action mailed January 10, 2005

Casaldi, et al. discloses a master processing apparatus 10 with a feed tray 96, which has an inoperative position, illustrated in FIGURE 1, and an operative position, shown in FIGURE 7. A discharge side of the apparatus has a support structure 100, which the Examiner likens to a tray. The support structure moves from an operative position, shown in FIGURES 7-10, to an inoperative position, shown in FIGURES 2, 4, and 5. However, the support structure serves to support the apparatus 10, and is not positioned to receive a laminated item from an outlet slot. Rather, in Casaldi it is stated that the advancement of a master is effected by manually pulling on the free ends of the stock materials 16, 18, extending from the discharge opening 44 of Casaldi's device (col. 5, lines 10-15). Moreover, in the operative position, the support structure of Casaldi extends under the apparatus to the side of the apparatus on which the inlet 42 is located. The support structure thus has no interaction whatsoever with the exiting item.

Moreover, placing the support structure in a position to receive a laminated item in an operative position would defeat the purpose of Casaldi's support structure. The function of the support structure of Casaldi is to support the apparatus in an upright position. Placing the support structure in a position to receive a laminated item from the discharge opening of Casaldi would require moving the support structure away from the base of the apparatus, where it would no longer serve its intended function. Thus, there is no motivation for moving Casaldi's support structure to a position to receive an item form the discharge opening.

Kerr, et al., which is cited against claims 5 and 9, discloses a laminator assembly having an entrance table 20 and an exit table 30. There is no suggestion in Kerr that these trays be movable to an upright position.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 and claims 2-9 dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

New claim 17 has been added which closely parallels amended clam 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 17 is in condition for allowance.

Atty. Dkt. No. MAEE 20065 Application Serial No. 10/810,357 Response to Office Action mailed January 10, 2005

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-17) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call the undersigned, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

April 8, 2005

Ann M. Skerry, Reg. No. 45, 655 1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579

(216) 861-5582